DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 314 FL 027 394

AUTHOR	Witten, Caryn
TITLE	Using Video To Teach for Sociolinguistic Competence in the Foreign Language Classroom.
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	35p.; In: Proceedings for the Texas Foreign Language [Education] Conference (Austin, Texas, March 31-April 1, 2000); see FL 027 384.
PUB TYPE	Journal Articles (080) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
JOURNAL CIT	Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education; v5 n1 p143-175 spec iss Fall 2000
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Students; Feedback; Global Approach; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Competence; Language Proficiency; Second Language Instruction; *Sociolinguistics; Spanish; Teaching Methods; *Videotape Recordings

ABSTRACT

This study worked to develop the sociolinguistic competence of college learners of first-year Spanish using input enhancement techniques that required learners to actively view video. Research shows that native speakers are more sensitive to sociolinguistic errors than to grammatical errors made by nonnative speakers. Therefore, the study hypothesized that educating language learners about sociolinguistic differences would result in their having more positive relationships in future contacts with speakers of other languages. On nine occasions, the control group students independently viewed episodes of a Spanish videotaped soap opera that used authentic language and culture. Following each viewing, they took in-class quizzes on the plot of the story. The intervention group viewed the same video and took the same quizzes, but before each of the nine viewings, they were given a take-home quiz to fill out while watching the video. At the end of the semester, all students completed three feedback instruments to determine their sociolinguistic awareness. Results indicated that the intervention group outperformed the control group at statistically significant levels in several areas. Interactive video viewing positively influenced their affect and time on task and enhanced sociolinguistic competence. It also increased students' global comprehension. (Contains 49 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 468 314

*Using Video to Teach for Sociolinguistic Competence in the Foreign Language Classroom**

CARYN WITTEN, The University of Texas at Austin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mark A. Carpenter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

FL027394

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*Using Video to Teach for Sociolinguistic Competence in the Foreign Language Classroom**

CARYN WITTEN, The University of Texas at Austin

This paper examines the findings from a classroom research project that involved developing the sociolinguistic competence of learners of first-year Spanish. This project used input enhancement techniques that required the learners to actively view video. Research shows that native speakers are more sensitive to sociolinguistic errors than to grammatical errors made by nonnative speakers. Therefore, it is hoped that educating language learners about sociolinguistic differences will result in their having more positive relationships in future contacts with speakers of other languages. The data from the study are encouraging regarding learners' ability to both recognize and use more culturally appropriate linguistic forms once they are overtly made aware of sociolinguistic differences.

INTRODUCTION

The focus of the classroom research project described in this paper was to assess the effect of implementing input enhancement strategies that encourage active video viewing on the development of the learners' sociolinguistic competence in a second-language (L2). To date, studies have been conducted in this area that employ video, audiotape, role play, and classroom meta-pragmatic discussion as independent variables to assess the development of sociolinguistic competence (Overfield, 1996) and that employ mainly meta-pragmatic classroom discussion (Pearson, forthcoming). The uniqueness of this current project is that it attempted to hold classroom discussion as constant as possible while isolating the effect of independent viewing of video with consciousness-raising activities on the L2 learning process.

Consciousness-raising has been defined as "the deliberate attempt to draw the learner's attention specifically to the formal properties of the target language" as opposed to "natural circumstances where attention to form may be minimal and sporadic" (Sharwood-Smith, 1981). The term "consciousness-raising," which refers to processes occurring in the learner's brain, is often replaced with the term "input enhancement" (Sharwood-Smith, 1993), which refers to what the instructor is doing to manipulate the learning process. This redefinition came about because it is much easier to document what the instructor is doing externally than to document what the learner is doing internally. The first studies that looked at input enhancement in the L2 context examined the acquisition of grammatical structures (Gass and Madden, 1985; Schachter, 1988; Sharwood-Smith, 1981, 1986; Tomlin and Villa, 1994). These researchers concluded that focusing the learner's attention on specific features of the L2 did increase acquisition of those features.

027 394

* Presented at the Texas Foreign Language Education Conference 2000 (TexFLEC 2000), University of Texas at Austin, March 31-April 1,.2000.

Since Hymes (1968, 1971) coined the term "communicative competence," L2 instructors have been increasingly interested in areas of linguistic competence other than grammar. As defined, communicative competence is composed of three abilities. These are grammatical competence, strategic competence, and sociolinguistic competence (Canale and Swain, 1980; Canale, 1984). These researchers later added discourse competence. This paper examines the area of sociolinguistic competence, which these researchers defined as the ability to use language appropriately in a given social context. Pragmatic competence is a closely related concept. While Canale and Swain proposed that pragmatic competence is a component of sociolinguistic competence, other researchers (Bachman, cited in Hadley, 1993) have proposed that sociolinguistic competence is a component of pragmatic competence. Because of this ambiguity of terminology in the research, the two terms will be used interchangeably in this paper.

Soon after some researchers began looking at the connection between input enhancement strategies and grammar acquisition, other researchers, especially Schmidt (1990), began theorizing about their application to the development of sociolinguistic competence. Other research (Ochs, 1979; Gleason, 1980; Bruner, 1981; Becker 1990, 1994) has documented that, while the bulk of the grammar of a child's first language (L1) is not overtly taught, the pragmatics of the L1 are overtly taught by the child's caretakers. This difference seems to imply that input enhancement techniques may be even more important in the area of L2 pragmatics than in the area of L2 grammar.

Unlike grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence is much harder to teach in the classroom setting. It may require contextualized, interactive language such as that found in video (Koike, 1989). Fortunately, modern technology has made video much more accessible for L2 instruction. Not only are many classrooms now equipped with VCRs, but it is reasonable to ask learners to view video independently outside of the classroom.

In part because of the popularity of Krashen's Monitor Model (1982, 1983, 1985), instructors often use video for passive "comprehensible input" to develop learners' listening comprehension skills. Further complicating this situation encountered in L2 pedagogy, which encourages passive viewing, is the observation that since childhood, we have become accustomed to watching television passively (Lonnergan, 1984), so it is natural for the learner to view pedagogical videos this way. Current research projects, such as mine, consider research on input enhancement in addition to Krashen's Monitor Model and attempt to change the learners' mode of interaction with the video component of the language course. In an attempt to change the learner's lifelong viewing habits, some researchers and instructors are asking learners to watch video actively, by noticing and recording formal properties of the language in addition to following the develop-

ment of the plot (Overfield, 1996; Pearson, forthcoming; Altman, 1989; Garza, 1996; Berwald, 1985; Gale and Brown, 1985; Gillespie, 1985; Lavery 1984; Mount, 1988).

One way for learners to acquire the pragmatic features of an L2 would be to immerse themselves in the target culture. Since immersion is not possible for many learners, video is the next best thing. In his research, Altman (1989) found that learners who viewed a Total Physical Response (TPR, Asher 1977, 1982) session performed as well as students who actually participated in the session. This finding implies that video can be a form of virtual reality for the language learner. An interesting study by Olshtain and Blum-Kulka (1985) concluded that, in the absence of overt teaching, it can take a language learner approximately 10 years to acquire sociolinguistic competence even in a total immersion environment. This evidence supports the claim that input enhancement is crucial to the development of L2 pragmatic competence, especially in a non-immersion setting.

Most research in the area of sociolinguistic competence has been conducted within the English as a Second/ Foreign Language (ESL/ EFL) community. This type of research in Spanish as a Second Language is growing, but still not as plentiful (Koike, Pearson, and Witten, in print).

While illuminating, research in ESL/EFL is not always readily transferable to the situation faced by other L2 educators for two main reasons. First, EFL instructors are dealing with learners who are in total immersion situations. Furthermore, learners of English are often more motivated by both intrinsic and instrumental factors (Terrell, 1977), because many plan to either immigrate to an English-speaking country or to obtain employment in which English is essential. On the other hand, instructors of languages other than English are more often dealing with learners who are simply fulfilling a language requirement or who have other motivations to master an L2 that are not as strong as that of the typical ESL/EFL learner.

Whatever the individual L2 learner's motivation, however, sociolinguistic competence is important for all of them. Research shows that native speakers are more sensitive to sociolinguistic errors than to grammatical errors made by nonnative speakers (Olshtain and Blum-Kulka, 1985). Therefore, in order to facilitate positive reactions by native speakers when a learner is interacting in the L2 environment, it is important that all L2 learners (including those who may never plan to master the language, but who may want to be able to use it at least informally throughout their lives or careers) be exposed to the existence of pragmatic differences within and across languages.

With the aforementioned factors in mind, this current research project investigated beginning learners of Spanish at a large, public American University and focused on their awareness of Spanish sociolinguistic differences as well as their use of certain forms.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The Research Questions

This study addressed three research questions. They are as follows:

1. What is the role of conscious awareness in the learning of L2 pragmatic features?

2. How can interactive video viewing enhance pragmatic input?

3. Does form-focused input enhancement affect learners' global comprehension?

The Subjects

The subjects for this study were more than 200 students enrolled in an accelerated first-year Spanish course at a large, public American university. This course condensed the first two semesters of the regular program into one semester. To qualify for this course, students had to achieve a certain score on the department's placement exam. Because of the nature of the class, the students tended to be at a relatively equal ability level. Students were assigned to the various sections of this course at random by the university's computerized scheduling system. Likewise, the author chose sections for this study at random. Also, the assignment of sections to either the test or control group was done randomly.

The study began with more than 200 subjects; however, almost half of the subjects were eliminated for various reasons. Students who were heritage speakers of the language or who had more than 3 months travel abroad exposure to the language were eliminated from the study. Also, those who did not complete all three feedback instruments at the end of the semester were eliminated. In the end, there was a total of 106 subjects. The test group consisted of 62 subjects, while the control group consisted of 44.

The Nine Control Group Treatments

The control group was given the department's suggested (though not mandatory) instructional methodology. They were asked to independently view episodes of *Destinos: An Introduction to Spanish* (VanPatten, et al., 1992) on nine occasions during the semester. *Destinos* is a pedagogical Spanish video program that, though scripted, exposes the learners to authentic language and culture in a soap opera format as the protagonist travels to various Spanish-speaking countries. Each of the nine sessions viewed at home by the learners contained roughly an hour of video. Following each viewing session, the students were required to take in-class quizzes prepared by their individual instructors, which focused solely on the plot of the video story. The quizzes were worth 5 points each and consisted of true/false, multiple-choice, or short answer questions. Thus, the nine *Destinos* quizzes were worth a total of 45 points. The semester grade was based on a 1,000-point system, so the video component was 4.5% of each student's semester grade.

The Nine Test Group Treatments

Though the test group saw the same episodes of the video and received the same amount of points for each assignment, it was given a much different approach. Before each of the nine viewings, the test group subjects were given a take-home quiz to fill out while watching the video. This closer involvement with the video is why their viewing style has been called "active" or "interactive" as opposed to the control group's viewing style, which was relatively passive in comparison. Since classroom instruction was held to a minimum for this experiment, the instructors who participated in both the control and test groups were unaware of the goal of the research project. They were simply told that we would provide the test group with *Destinos* quizzes and would also correct the quizzes.

Since pilot studies had confirmed that L2 learners do not readily understand the concepts of sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence (Witten, 1999), a brief two-page handout was provided to the students along with the first *Destinos* take-home quiz. A copy of the sociolinguistic portion of this handout can be found in Appendix A. An example of the first take-home quiz given to the learners in the test group can be found in Appendix B. The quizzes, which will also be called treatments throughout this study, asked students to find examples in the areas of grammatical, strategic, and sociolinguistic competence from the video. The treatments also asked them to find examples of new cultural knowledge and to provide a summary of the plot.

In studies done by VanPatten (1989, 1990), it was discovered that focusing the learners' attention on the formal properties of a language during listening exercises can have deleterious effects on overall, global comprehension. Since this is not a favorable situation, in this study, we also wanted to determine whether we were negatively affecting students' overall comprehension. Therefore, we asked the subjects to provide plot summaries in order to stress the importance of global comprehension. We also examined plot comprehension in the final feedback at the end of the semester in order to address our third research question.

For the purpose of this study, only the questions in the area of sociolinguistic competence on the take-home quizzes (treatments) are relevant. While it would be interesting to know if and how this approach increased the learners' strategic and grammatical competence and world knowledge, these areas do not fall within the scope of this study. These other lines of inquiry were included in the treatments for pedagogical reasons as well as to serve as distracters to keep learners and their instructors from knowing the purpose of this study.

Upon completion of the first treatment, the test group instructors provided the author with the subjects' responses to the treatments. These quizzes were corrected and were returned to the instructors along with a list of two or three "good" sample re-

sponses to each area of the take-home quizzes. Instructors were asked to allow these students to read their answers to the class, so that those who had been denied credit would understand why. This minimal intervention in the learning process was deemed necessary since the learners were being graded on these treatments.

As with the control group, the learners of the test group were given 5 points for each of the treatments. Since they were being asked to do much more work for their 5 points than those in the control group, affect was a concern. Affect of both test and control groups was examined at the end of the semester, because it has been demonstrated to influence the learning process (Gardner and Lambert, 1972, Horwitz, 1988; Young, 1992).

Some Sample Responses to the Nine Test Group Treatments

In order to provide the reader with an example of the type of information the author was soliciting with the treatments, the following are some sample responses from the first treatment (Appendix B) in the two areas of sociolinguistic competence. For example on Question 1, which asked students to provide examples of characters using either the formal or informal Spanish address, two typical responses were as follows:

"When Juan walked into the kitchen when Arturo and Pedro were talking, Raquel and Angela were talking on the phone. They were having a friendly conversation using the *tú* (informal) form."

"When Raquel was calling Pedro, she was talking to his housekeeper (the woman in pink). Raquel said '. . . *y usted*?' (formal form) when responding to the housekeeper. I think she said this, because the housekeeper was older. She said it to be respectful."

The first responder was asked to explain why he thought the two characters used the informal address form. It was hoped that he would infer that "friendliness" was not necessarily a factor in choice of address. The second responder was asked to read her example to the class, because it contained a specific rationale for the use of the formal address.

For Question 2, which asked students to look for examples of characters using various speech acts in order to determine if they were similar or different from what would be used by a native speaker of their language or dialect, below are two typical responses:

"When Pati was being told that her play was controversial and she should change it, she rebuked this. When she rebuked this fact, she became very fidgety—for example, she moved her hands a lot. I think that this is very much alike in English. I think we also move our hands for emphasis when we disagree."

"When they answer the phone, they say '*bueno*' (good) instead of 'hello.'"

The learner who provided the first response was asked to provide actual quotes the next time. Though body language is certainly important to communication, pragmatic compe-

tence is concerned with linguistic realizations of communication. The second responder was asked to read his response to the class, because it was a good example of pragmatic differences between English and Spanish.

In order to vary instructional strategy and also to look at different types of processing, the treatments given to learners took both deductive and inductive approaches to testing the learners' ability to respond to the different areas addressed in the *Destinos* quizzes. For example, in the fourth worksheet (Appendix C), instead of being asked to glean a quote from the episodes, students were asked to look for and analyze a specific quote in the episode they were viewing. The former approach is more inductive in nature, because it asks learners to pick a specific quote from a general corpus. The latter approach is more deductive in nature, because it asks the learner to take a specific quote and then to draw some general observations from that quote.

In response to the sociolinguistic section on the fourth quiz, here are some "good" answers, which students were asked to share with the class:

Question 1. "Jorge says to Raquel *'Me puedes tutear. ¿El tuteo es mas íntimo, no?'* (You can use the informal address form with me. It is more intimate, don't you think?) In English, we cannot say this, because we only use the word 'you.'"

Question 3. "Raquel says *'¿No crees que es mejor que él mismo compre el cine?'* (Don't you think it is better that HE buys the theater with his own money?) I think if I were to make a suggestion it would be similar to this, if I were talking in English."

In the fifth treatment (quiz) (Appendix D), in both the sociolinguistic and grammatical competence sections learners were asked to look for specific examples from the dialogue. In this way, learners were asked to use both inductive and deductive strategies throughout the semester.

Data Collection Methodology

At the end of the semester, three feedback instruments were given to learners in both the test and control groups to determine if and how their sociolinguistic awareness and use were affected by the different treatments (quizzes) that the two groups received throughout the semester. Following are an explanation of the feedback instruments and an analysis of the data that was obtained from them.

DATA ANALYSIS

The three feedback instruments given to both the test and control groups at the end of the semester were a two-part written feedback form that contained several lines of inquiry, an oral role-play instrument, and a multiple-choice instrument that was included as part of the semester final exam. These instruments can be found in Appendices E, F, and G, respectively. The results from these three instruments are shown on Table 1. They will now be discussed in detail.

TABLE 1
RESULTS FROM THE THREE FEEDBACK INSTRUMENTS

	Test group*	Control group*	T>C ratio**	Chi square***	t test***
Written feedback (Part B)	55%	45%	12 out of 15	Sig. or trend on 6 out of 15 items	0.002
Oral feedback	56%	48%	7 out of 10	N/A	0.15
Multiple choice feedback	59.40%	59.30%	4 out of 8	Sig. on 1 out of 8items	0.97
Pragmatic awareness	51%	48%	9 out of 11	N/A	0.016
Pragmatic use/production	57%	51%	15 out of 24	N/A	0.046
Affect			10 out of 11	Sig. or trend on 5 out of 11 items	N/A
Time on task-missed episodes	14%	24%	N/A	0.144	0.03
Time on task-minutes	102.5	66.8	N/A	0.017	N/A
Plot items recalled	9.1	7.3	N/A	0.531	0.08

*Raw scores/total percent of items answered correctly

**Number of items on which the test group outperformed the control group. For example, on the written feedback, the test group scored higher than the control group on 12 out of a total of 15 items.

***Statistical significance p= or < .05; Statistical trend p>.05-.10

The Written Feedback Effect

First, the feedback provided in the various areas on Part A and Part B of the written feedback form (Appendix E) will be analyzed. In Part A, items 1 through 9, 12, and 13 dealt with areas of affect, such as the learners' attitudes toward the video component of the course, the way it was presented, and its usefulness. Of these 11 items, the test group's responses were more positive on 10 items. (This information can be found under the column labeled "T>C ratio" and in the row labeled "Affect" on the above table.) Furthermore, statistical significance was found in the responses to three of these items. Statistical significance was defined as a p value of equal or less than .05 on the chi square test.

There were also some interesting "internals" concerning the feedback in this data. For example, there was statistical significance when learners were asked if and why they dreaded watching the video (Item A5, Appendix E). This was the only affect question on which the test group showed more negativity than the control group. However, on closer analysis it was found that the test group gave both more positive and more negative responses on the Likert scale, while the control group was more neutral.

When asked if the video helped with the learners' pragmatic acquisition (Item A7), 46% of the test group responded with a 1 or a 2 on the Likert scale, while only 16% of the control group did so. (On the Likert scale developed for this study 1 indicated the highest level of agreement with a statement and 5 indicated the highest level of disagreement with a statement.) When asked about the video's usefulness to learn about culture (Item A4), the test group's responses were more positive; however, once again, the test group also gave more negative responses as well, while the control group was more neutral on the subject.

Statistical trends, which were defined as a probability of coincidence (p value) of greater than .05 but not over .10 on the chi square test, were found in response to two affect items. In response to Item A1 regarding the video's usefulness in learning grammar, 40% of the test group responded with a 1 or 2 on the Likert scale, while only 16% of the control group agreed with the statement. On Item A6 dealing with perceptions of fairness regarding the *Destinos* quizzes, the two groups gave nearly equal positive responses, while the control group gave more negative responses. In other words, a nearly equal number of respondents from each group responded with a 1 or 2 on the Likert scale, but more control group subjects responded with a 4 or 5, while more test group subjects responded with a neutral 3. The responses to this item were interesting because students in the test group were asked to work so much harder on each 5 point quiz than those in the control group. Apparently this hard work did not have a negative influence on the test group's attitude toward the treatments as was expected.

An interesting, though not statistically significant, response was that on Item A8 in which the learners were asked to rank the importance of different components of the course. While 60% of the control group saw the video as the least important component of the class, only 43% of the test group thought so. This difference in attitude may indicate that the treatments made the video component of the course more meaningful to the learners in the test group.

In response to Item A12, which asked students for suggestions on how to improve the course, 42% of the test group suggested that there should be more support in the classroom. This response was not surprising since, as the reader will recall, the test group instructors were purposefully left out of the process of giving and correcting quizzes to the greatest extent possible. The surprise is that a slightly higher percentage of the control group, 50%, also wished their instructors had spent more time on the video component of the course during class time. Though the author offered to correct the control group quizzes, they were designed by the individual instructors. The fact that so many students expressed a desire to spend more class time on the video component seems to indicate that both test and control group instructors gave the video component of the course less importance relative to the other components of the course. Therefore, the intervention into the learning process by the treatments developed for this study did not seem to have a discernible effect on the instructors' emphasis on the video component. It is important to note that this component of the course was treated as relatively unimportant by the instructors (remember, it was given a small weight in the overall grade, 4.5%), because it makes the results that will be presented later seem even more impressive.

As for the affect section as a whole, it is noteworthy that the test group had a much more positive attitude toward the video component of the class. Since affect influences motivation and learning, affect could be seen as an intervening variable in the experiment. Providing the students with input enhancement instruments and encouraging them to watch video actively apparently resulted in a more positive affect, which could have in turn influenced the learners' pragmatic awareness and use (which will be discussed later in this section).

The Written Feedback-Time on Task

Another possible intervening variable that could have an effect on students' awareness and acquisition of pragmatic features of the L2 could be time on task. We therefore included two items on the written feedback to determine if the test group spent more time on task than the control group. This was done with Items A10 and A11 of Appendix E. Statistical significance was found on both questions. (The two rows labeled time on task on Table 1 present these findings.) While the test group on average missed 14% of the viewings, the control group missed 24%. Also, the test group spent an average of 102.5 minutes on each

assignment while the control group only spent 66.8 minutes.

The Written Feedback-Global Comprehension

In order to address the third research question in this study, which was "Does form-focused input enhancement affect learners global comprehension?," we included two items on the written feedback instrument to determine if interactive video viewing with form-focused input enhancement assignments would influence the learners' comprehension of the plot of the video series (Items A15 and B15 of the written feedback instrument in Appendix E). As the row labeled "plot items recalled" of Table 1 shows, the treatments did not have a deleterious affect on the learners' global comprehension. In fact, the test group recalled more details on average than the control group did on Item B15. The chi square test, which compares the frequency of individual answers, showed no statistical significance between the two groups; however, the t test, which compares overall means, did find a statistical trend when comparing the performance of the two groups.

On Item A15 learners in the test group were also given the opportunity to provide a self-report style opinion regarding how they believed the take-home quizzes affected their ability to comprehend the plot of *Destinos*. The results of this inquiry were also positive. Of the learners in the test group, 44% believed that the treatments actually increased their global comprehension, 32% had a neutral opinion, and only 24% of the respondents believed that these treatments had a negative effect on their overall plot comprehension.

The Written Feedback-Deductive and Inductive Learning

In response to Items A16 and A17 on the written feedback form, learners in the test group provided some interesting feedback. Table 2 below outlines this feedback. These responses were surprising, because it was thought that the open-ended type questions like that on the first quiz (Appendix B) would pose less difficulty than specific questions like those on the fourth and fifth quizzes (Appendices C and D.). The learners, however, disagreed. They also seem to adhere to the "no pain, no gain" philosophy regarding their responses to Item A17.

The Written Feedback-Pragmatic Awareness and Use

Part B of the written feedback instrument dealt with learners' awareness and use of appropriate pragmatic features of the Spanish language. There were a total of 15 items. As the row labeled "Written feedback (Part B)" and column labeled "T>C ratio" on Table 1 indicates, the test group responded more appropriately than the control group on 12 of the 15 items, while the control group responded more appropriately on two of these items, and the two groups tied on one. The t test for statistical significance showed that the test group's overall superior performance

TABLE 2
INDUCTIVE VS. DEDUCTIVE TREATMENT ITEMS (Test group only)

	Level of difficulty	Level of learning
Inductive	38%	43%
Deductive	25%	13%
Equal	32%	40%

on the written feedback section was significant.

The author also performed chi square tests for significance on each of the 15 items. Statistical significance was found in 6 items. Of these, the test group outperformed the control group on five. These five items included Items B1, 3, 7, 9, and 12. The control group, however, did significantly better on Item B5. A statistical trend (meaning a chi square p value of over .05 but not over .10) was found on one of the 15 items. This was on Item B6 in which the test group had a more sociolinguistically appropriate style to introduce two friends to each other.

The Oral Feedback

As Table 1 indicates, the test group also used more pragmatically appropriate forms than the control group on the oral feedback instrument. As can be seen in Appendix F, there was a total of 10 items which were addressed during the oral role plays. The test group responded more appropriately on 7 items (1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 9), while the control group gave more pragmatically appropriate responses on two items (6 and 10). They tied on Item 4. However, the t test p value of .15 is not low enough to claim any statistical significance or trend between the two groups' performance on the oral feedback instrument. These results indicate that, while the students in the test group had a better awareness of pragmatic differences between Spanish and English when they had time to think on the written feedback form, when they had to speak spontaneously, they did not produce significantly more appropriate utterances than the control group.

The Multiple-Choice Feedback

Three weeks after the written and oral feedback were obtained from the subjects, they took their semester final. On the final, we placed an optional section for the students to respond to. We were not very optimistic that many students would respond to this section, but were pleasantly surprised that almost all students did take the time to fill it out. Very few subjects had to be eliminated from the total original corpus due to noncompliance with this section of the feedback.

This third and final feedback instrument can be found in Appendix G. It consisted of eight multiple-choice questions. As Table 1 indicates, the

data from this instrument showed nearly equal performance by the two groups. Overall, the **control** group outperformed the test group on half of the items (Items 3, 4, 6, and 8). Chi squares on the responses to the individual items showed statistical significance on only one item- Item 2. On this item, 87% of the test group marked the correct answer while only 72% of the control group did so.

These disappointing results seem to indicate that, while the test group learners performed better on both written and oral production tasks, when the correct answer was available in a multiple choice format, all learners had roughly equal L2 pragmatic awareness. Since this instrument was given three weeks subsequent to the other two, it also could indicate that short-term advantages were soon lost.

Pragmatic Awareness and Use

Finally, separate analyses were done on all items of the three feedback instruments (written, oral, and multiple choice) involving actual written or oral use of appropriate sociolinguistic forms. All items of the three feedback instruments that dealt with awareness of pragmatic differences between the two languages were also analyzed.

We analyzed pragmatic awareness as well as actual use, because a general awareness that pragmatic differences exist is very important to future performance of language learners. As was previously mentioned, we are taught the pragmatics of our L1 at an early age by our caretakers. However, during this acculturation process we are not taught that certain utterances are appropriate in our specific language community, but we are taught that they are the **only** polite and correct utterances expected in a given social situation. This childhood acculturation process leads people to believe that sociolinguistic conventions are universal. Because of this belief, L2 learners have a tendency to transfer their L1 pragmatics to the L2 (Kasper, 1992; Koike, 1995). When the transfer is based on incorrect assumptions, interpersonal problems can arise. The L1 language learning phenomenon explains why we tend to be more offended by foreigners' pragmatic errors than by their grammar errors. In other words, we expect grammatical errors, but not pragmatic errors. Thus, showing L2 learners that there are pragmatic differences between languages, changes their a priori assumption that such differences do not exist. This realization that pragmatics are not universal can lead to more positive intercultural interactions.

Another reason that it is important to simply heighten the L2 learner's awareness that pragmatic differences will exist in the L2 rather than to only rely on teaching the use of specific features is that all pragmatic features of an L2 cannot be learned in the classroom. All the sociolinguistic differences between an L1 and an L2 cannot be overtly taught, because there are too many of them. Also, there are not only differences between languages, but there are also sociolinguistic differences between same language groups or subcultures

based on such factors as age, gender (Tannen, 1990), socioeconomics, region, and ethnicity.

As the rows labeled "Pragmatic awareness" and "Pragmatic use/production" on Table 1 indicate, the test group demonstrated a statistically significant greater overall awareness of pragmatic differences between the two languages when relevant items on all three feedback instruments are considered. On all items of the three feedback instruments concerning actual production and use of specific pragmatic features of Spanish, the test group also showed statistically significant superior performance.

CONCLUSIONS

Though the mean scores given in Table 1 suggest that much more work needs to be done with these learners, it is encouraging that after only one semester and with the manipulation of only 4.5% of the course grade, the test group did seem to learn a great deal about pragmatic differences between the English and Spanish language.

We now return to the three original research questions posed at the beginning of this paper. In response to the first of the three research questions, it appears that the role of conscious learning seems to be important in the learning of L2 pragmatic features. The input enhancement activities appear to have led the learners of the test group to outperform those of the control group at statistically significant levels in several areas. We believe that researchers now need to combine these instructional strategies with others that have had some significant results (such as metapragmatic discussion and role play in the classroom) in order to obtain a higher level acquisition of L2 pragmatic features.

In response to the second research question, it appears that interactive video viewing had positive effects on the learners' affect and time on task as well as on fomenting a greater sociolinguistic competence. The intervening variables of a more positive affect and more time on task may have assisted in increasing the learners' acquisition of L2 pragmatic features. Also, though not relevant to this study, other components of L2 acquisition (e.g., grammar, strategic competence, vocabulary, pronunciation, etc.) could have been positively affected by these intervening variables.

As for the third research question, the experimental treatments appear to have helped increase the learners' global comprehension. This is probably because learners were primarily looking for lexical-level details, which are a component of global comprehension.

AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND PEDAGOGICAL APPLICATION

This research could be easily extended and applied to more areas of second language learning. With the data that has been collected for this experiment, we would now like to look at individual speech acts, such as requests, salutations, and introductions, to ascertain any effects of the

treatments that the test group was given on these specific linguistic behaviors.

It would be interesting to conduct a similar experiment, but to also analyze the effects of input enhancement treatments and interactive video viewing on the development of grammatical and strategic competence in addition to the development of sociolinguistic competence.

As previously mentioned in this study, other researchers (Overfield, 1996, Pearson, forthcoming) have conducted similar experiments dealing with using video to develop better sociolinguistic competence. While this experiment held classroom interaction and instruction as constant as possible, these other researchers did intervene in the classroom teaching process with metapragmatic discussions and role plays. They also obtained some positive responses to their treatments. It would be interesting to now combine their and our instructional strategies to determine if a more profound effect on the learning of sociolinguistic features of an L2 could be achieved.

Finally, once researchers determine which combination of strategies provides the best results, we need to develop instructional materials that best address raising L2 learners' sociolinguistic competence. We also can use this and other research to help raise L2 learners' communicative competence levels in all areas through the use of input enhancement techniques and interactive materials used in conjunction with pedagogical video programs.

References

Altman, R. (1989). *The video connection: Integrating video into language teaching*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Asher, J. (1977). *Learning another language through actions*. Los Gatos, California: Sky Oaks Productions.

Asher, J. (1982). The Total Physical Response approach. In R. Blair (Ed.), *Innovative Approaches to Language Teaching*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Becker, J. (1994). Pragmatic socialization: Parental input to preschoolers. *Discourse Processes, 17*, 131-148.

Becker, J. (1990). Processes in the acquisition of pragmatic competence. In G. Conti-Ramsden and C. Snow (Eds.), *Children's Language. Vol. 7* (pp. 7-24). Hillsdale, NJ.: Erlbaum.

Berwald, Jean-Pierre. (1985). Video and second language learning. In Gillespie, J. (Ed.), *Studies in Language Learning* (pp.3-16). Urbana-Champaign: Publication of the Language Learning Laboratory.

Bruner, J. (1981). The Pragmatics of acquisition. In W. Deutsch (Ed.), *The child's construction of language*._New York: Academic Press.

Canale, Michael. (1984). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. Richards and R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and*

Communication. New York: Longman Inc

Canale, Michael and Merrill Swain. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1-47.

Gale, Larrie E. and Bruce L. Brown. (1985). A theory of learning and skill-acquisition applied to interactive video: Activities at the David O. McKay Institute, Brigham Young University. In J.B. Gillespie (Ed.), *Studies in Language Learning* (pp. 105-114). Urbana-Champaign: Publication of the Language Learning Laboratory.

Gardner, R. and W. Lambert. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*._Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Garza, T. (1996). The message is the medium: Using video materials to facilitate foreign language performance. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education. (2)*, 2, 1-18.

Gass, S. and Madden, C., (Eds.). (1985). *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley MA: Newbury House.

Gass, S., and Varonis, E. (1994). Input, integration, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16*, 283-302.

Gillespie, J. (1985). *Studies in language learning: Special issue on video and second language learning*. Urbana-Champaign: Publication of the Language Learning Laboratory.

Gleason, J. (1980). The acquisition of social speech: Routines and politeness formulae. In H. Giles, W.P. Robinson and P.M. Smith (Eds.), *Language: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 21-27). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Hadley, Alice Omaggio. (1993). *Teaching language in context*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Horwitz, E. (1988) . The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal, 72*, 283-294.

Hymes, D. H. (1968). Sociolinguistics. *Language Sciences, 1*, 23-26.

Hymes, D.H. (1971). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride and Janet Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd.

Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research, 8.3*, 203-223.

Koike, D., Pearson, L, and Witten, C. (forthcoming). Research in discourse analysis and pragmatics. In Lafford, B. & Salaberry, R. (Eds.), *Studies in Spanish second language acquisition: The state of the science*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Koike, D. (1995). Transfer of pragmatic competence and suggestions in Spanish foreign language learning. In Susan Gass and Joyce Neu, (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 257-281). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Koike, Dale. (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts in interlanguage. *Modern Language Journal* 73(3), 279-289.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. Essex: Longman Group.

Krashen, S. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Hayward, CA: Alemany Press

Lavery, M. (1984). *Active viewing plus*. Kettering: Modern English Publications, Ltd.

Lonergan, J. (1984). *Video in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mount, R. et al., (1988). The videocassette challenge: Strategies for the foreign language teacher. *New Challenges and Opportunities. Dimension: Languages 87. Report of the Southern Conference on Language Teaching Proceedings*.

Ochs, E. (1979). Introduction: What child language can contribute to pragmatics. In E. Ocks and B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 1-17). New York: Academic Press.

Olshtain, E, and Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. (1985). Degree of approximation: Nonnative reaction to native speech act behavior. In Susan Gass and Carolyn Madden (Eds.). *Input in second language acquisition* (pp.303-323). Cambridge: Newbury House.

Overfield, Denise. (1996). *Teaching pragmatic competence: Input, interaction and consiousness-raising*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.

Pearson, L. (2000) . *Pragmatics and foreign language teaching: The effect of metapragmatic discussions on the acquisition of Spanish commands, polite requests, apologies, and expressions of gratitude*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin.

Richards, J., & Schmidt, R. (Eds.). (1984). *Language and Communication*. New York: Longman Inc.

Savignon, S. (1983). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Schachter, J. (1988). Second language acquisition and its relationship to universal grammar. *Applied Linguistics 9*, 219-235.

Schmidt, R. (1990). *Conscousness, Learning and Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Paper presented at the Meeting of the World Congress of Applied Linguistics. Thessaloniki, Greece, April.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1981). Consciousness-raising and the second language learner. *Applied Linguistics*, 2, 159-169.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1986). Comprehension versus acquisition:

Two ways of processing input. *Applied Linguistics, 7,* 239-253.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed second language acquisition: Theoretical basis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15,* 165-180.

Tannen, Deborah. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation.* New York: Ballantine.

Terrell, T. (1977). A natural approach to second language acquisition and learning. *Modern Language Journal, 61,* 325-337.

Tomlin, Russell S., and Victor Villa. (1994). Attention in cognitive science and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16,* 183-203.

VanPatten, B. (1990). Attending to form and content in the input: An experiment in consciousness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12,* 287-301.

VanPatten, B. (1989). Can learners attend to form and content while processing input? *Hispania, 72,* 409-417.

VanPatten, B., M. Marks, R. Teschner, and T. Dorwick. (1992). *Destinos: An introduction to Spanish* (Videotape). New York: The Annenberg/CPB Collection.

Witten, C. (1999). Teaching for pragmatic competence in the beginning Spanish L2 classroom: A synopsis of a pilot study. In E. Widener, et al. (Eds.). *Proceedings of the eighth colloquium on Hispanic & Luso-Brazilian Literature and Romance Linguistics* (pp. 153-163). Austin: Department of Spanish and Portuguese, The University of Texas.

Young, J. (1992). Language anxiety from the foreign language specialist's perspective: Interviews with Krashen, Omaggio Hadley, Terrell, and Rardin. *Foreign Language Annuals, 25,* 157-172.

APPENDIX A
DEFINITION AND EXPLANATION OF SOCIOLINGUISTIC COMPETENCE

Sociolinguistic competence involves the appropriate use of language within various social contexts or situations. It can be seen as "verbal etiquette." Research has shown that parents rarely teach any grammar to their children, but that they are very active in teaching them how to make appropriate requests, apologies, expressions of gratitude, etc. From this we may infer that humans are more concerned with appropriateness than correctness in speech.

If you remember back to your childhood, you were probably never told to say "May I please have a piece of candy" instead of "Give me some candy," because that is the way that *people in your country* should make requests. On the contrary, you were probably taught to say it that way, because it was "good" and "polite." In other words, verbal "manners" are taught as though they are exactly the same among all humans. The problem is that this is not always the case. But, since people are taught this way, they expect all people to have the same concepts of what would be polite and what would be rude to say in a given situation. So, while people are tolerant of grammar errors in young children and foreigners, they are not as tolerant of sociolinguistic *faux pas*. Therefore, when you travel to a foreign country or deal with foreigners in the future, sociolinguistic competence is perhaps the most important indicator of how you will be perceived by the people to whom you speak.

While parents focus on sociolinguistic competence and allow children to learn grammar mostly on their own, in the foreign language classroom, instructors take the opposite approach. Grammar is taught extensively while matters of social etiquette are usually relegated to the end of the chapter where they are usually overlooked due to time concerns. In defense of instructors, these sections are also overlooked, because sociolinguistic competence would be extremely difficult to teach in a classroom setting. While young children are in natural social situations where their parents can be constantly reminding them of the appropriate thing to say in each situation, in a classroom, only the teacher is a native or near-native speaker and the setting is not "natural" at all. The only way the teacher could reasonably teach appropriate requests would be to say, in English, something like "When you're in a fancy restaurant, say . . x . ., When you're in a dive, say . . y . ., When you're with a friend, say . . z . ." The instructor could try to simulate these different situations in the classroom, but again, this would be very artificial and might still not be helpful to the students. This is where *Destinos* can be very helpful. In this program native Spanish speakers interact in many different situations with people of different ages, socioeconomic status, gender, and regional backgrounds. If you focus your attention on what is said in various situations, you will learn a great deal about sociolinguistics. The exercises in this packet will help you to do this.

APPENDIX B
WORKSHEET NO. 1
Destinos, Episodes #1 and 2 and #48 and 49 (Review of Episodes 3-18)

*Please do the plot summary in Spanish. It will be graded for content only, not for grammar. The remaining sections may be done in either English or Spanish.

Plot summary:

1. Sociolinguistic competence: Give an example of a character using either formal (*usted*) or informal (*tú*) address with another character. Provide the context of the situation, and state why you believe the formal/informal was used in this situation.
   Situation and characters
   Actual quote
   Why do you think this form was used?

2. Sociolinguistic competence: Note how language was used in social situations in *Destinos*. Provide the context and state which speech act you were observing (request, apology, compliment, insult, argument, suggestion, complaint, refusal, rebuke, etc.). Here you may also note examples of "deixis" (coming, going, bringing, taking, here there, etc.). Mention how Spanish manners and expressions are alike or different from English or other languages which you know.
   Situation and characters
   Actual quote
   Type of speech act
   Is this alike or different from what should be said in the same situation in English or in another language that you know well?
   If different, what would be more appropriate in your language (culture) to say in this same situation?

Strategic competence: How did you use context clues (a few key words) to make sense of an ambiguous situation or dialogue? With these limited "pieces" of the entire puzzle, what do you <u>think</u> was being said or done?
Key words (quote)
Your interpretation of what was going on

Grammatical competence: Which of the grammar points from a recent class did you notice in the episodes? Provide speakers, situation, actual words, and note which grammar point the characters wre applying.
Situation and characters
Actual quote

New grammar point being used

Language as a tool to increase world knowledge: Name what you learned about history, geography, art, music, health, economics, politics, business, law, etc. from watching these episodes. (i.e., What Jeopardy question could you answer today that you would have missed yesterday?)
Jeopardy category
New knowledge

APPENDIX C
WORKSHEET #4
***Destinos*, Episodes #23 and 24**

*NOTE: There have been some changes. Read before viewing
**Please do the plot summary in Spanish. It will be graded for content only, not for grammar. The remaining sections may be done in either English or Spanish.

Plot summary:

Sociolinguistic competence: In episode 24, Raquel takes a strong dislike to a character she has recently met. What does this character say that makes her dislike him? (Focus on words, not actions.)
Quotes:

In this same situation, how does Raquel express her dislike of this individual without being blatantly rude? Comment on both verbal expression and body language.
Quotes:

In episode 24, Raquel makes a suggestion to Angela on a rather touchy subject. How exactly does she phrase her suggestion? Is this similar to or different from the way you would make such a suggestion in English?
Quote:

Alike or different from English?
Explain:

Grammatical competence: Which of the grammar points from a recent class did you notice in the episodes? Provide speakers, situation, actual words, and note which grammar point the characters wre applying.
Situation and characters-
Actual quote-
New grammar point being used-

Language as a tool to increase world knowledge: Name what you learned about history, geography, art, music, health, economics, politics, business, law, etc. from watching these episodes. (i.e., What Jeopardy question could you answer today that you would have missed yesterday?)
Jeopardy category
New knowledge

APPENDIX D
Worksheet #5
***Destinos*, Episodes #27 and 28**

*NOTE: There have been some changes. Read before viewing
**Please do the plot summary in Spanish. It will be graded for content only, not for grammar. The remaining sections may be done in either English or Spanish.

Plot summary:

Sociolinguistic competence: In episode 27, at one point Raquel and Angela think there is a mistake in the hospital registration list. EXACTLY what words does Raquel use to ask the receptionist whether it's possible that there's a mistake? Would an exact translation of her words be equally polite in English?
Quote:
Translation:
Cross-cultural analysis:

2 and 3: While there's not a lot of action in these two episodes, there are lots of examples of speech acts. Find one example of each of the following: request, leave-taking (saying good night or good bye), consoling/comforting. How were these similar to or different from the way they are done in English (or any other languages you speak)?
Request quote:
Compare to English:
Leave-taking quote:
Compare to English:
Consoling quote:
Compare to English:

4 and 5. Grammatical competence: Find three examples each of the use of preterite and imperfect verbal aspects. How can you explain the choice of aspect in each case?
PRETERITE quotes:
1.
why?
2.
why?
3.

why?
IMPERFECT quotes:
1.
why?
2.
why?
3.
why?

APPENDIX E
WRITTEN FEEDBACK

INSTRUCTOR_____NAME_____

(No one, but Caryn Witten will read individual responses. They will be held in strict confidence. If any are used in my research, a pseudonym will be used. I appreciate your candid observations.)

PART A
PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS ON A SCALE OF 1 - 5.

1. *Destinos* helped me to improve my Spanish grammar.

Agree			Disagree		Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	*

[To save space, Likert scale is omitted for the following items.]

2. *Destinos* improved my Spanish listening comprehension.

3. The *Destinos* part of the course seemed mostly like "busy work" to me. It didn't help improve my Spanish much.

4. *Destinos* was useful to learn about Hispanic culture.

5. I always dreaded the days I had to watch *Destinos*.

EXPLAIN WHY OR WHY NOT

_____

_____

6. Our *Destinos* quizzes seemed fair to me, because they accurately reflected what I learned from the program.

7. *Destinos* taught me a lot about what to say in different situations in Spanish-speaking countries. (For example, it taught me when to use the 'tú' or 'usted' form, how to answer the phone in Spanish, etc.)

8, PLEASE RANK THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES IN ORDER OF HOW USEFUL THEY WERE IN TEACHING YOU SPANISH. 1=1st, 2=2nd most useful, etc.

_____ Reading Portfolios
_____ Written Compositions
_____ *Destinos*
_____ Homework grammar assignments
_____ Oral interviews and presentations

9. *DESTINOS* IS THE MOST USEFUL FOR LEARNING. . . 1=1st, 2=2nd most useful, etc.

_____ Grammar
_____ Listening Comprehension
_____ To learn what Spanish speakers say in different situations
_____ Culture
_____ Pronunciation

Of the 9 *Destinos* viewings, how many did you miss?_____ (Remember these answers are confidential.)

11. How much time on average did you spend on *Destinos* each week? _____

12. If you were a Spanish instructor, how would you make *Destinos* more useful to the students?

_____

_____

13. What do you think about *Destinos* and the way it was used in this class?

(The remaining questions are for students who had take home *Destinos* quizzes only)

14. Which statement best describes your approach to doing the take-home quizzes (check all that apply)

_____ a. I would get the information needed to fill out the questions as soon as possible and then relax and watch the rest of the show for the sake of the plot only.
_____ b. I would watch the show focusing on the plot and then get the information for the quizzes near the end of the episodes.
_____ c. I would look for answers to the quizzes at a relaxed pace throughout the episodes.

_____ d. After I got the answers, I would keep sociolinguistic competence, strategic competence, etc. in mind while watching the rest of the episodes.

_____ e. I watched the episodes long enough to get the answers to the questions.

_____ f. Other _____

15. How did doing the take-home quizzes affect your overall understanding of what was going on in *Destinos?*

_____ a. They helped me to understand the plot better, because I had to concentrate more.

_____ b. They were distracting and made it hard to focus on the plot.

_____ c. Other reaction _____

16. Which type of question did you find more difficult?
    a. Questions that asked me to find a quote in a GENERAL area (grammar, sociolinguistics, etc.) on my own.
    b. Questions that asked me to find a SPECIFIC quote (ex. What did Jorge say to Raquel when....)
    c. They were equally challenging.

17. Which type of question made you LEARN more?
    a. Questions that asked me to find a quote in a GNERAL area on my own
    b. Questions that asked me to find a SPECIFIC quote
    c. They were equally useful/practical to improve my Spanish.
    d. They were equally useless to improve my Spanish.

PART B

PLEASE RESPOND WITH SHORT ANSWERS IN ENGLISH OR SPANISH. YOU MAY USE THE WAY THE CHARACTERS IN *DESTINOS* TALKED TO EACH OTHER TO HELP YOU ANSWER.

1. When a person says, "Me puedes tutuear. El tuteo es más íntimo," what is being suggested?

_____

_____

2. Have you notice any differences between what English-speaking Americans and Spanish speakers say when beginning or ending a telephone conversation or is what they say a direct translation of what we say?

_____

_____

3. Give some examples of situations when the 'tú' form would be used and situations when the 'usted' form would be used.

'Tú'

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

'Usted'

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

4. Is the following suggestion polite in Spanish when one thinks an error has been made?

"¿No será un error?" YES NO DON'T KNOW

EXPLAIN_____

_____

Is an exact translation acceptable in English? YES NO

EXPLAIN_____

_____

5. In *Destinos* when Angela wanted to go to Mexico with Raquel, did she speak to her family in a way that would be different in American culture?

YES NO EXPLAIN

_____

_____

6. Give an example of a typical introduction of one person to another in Spanish. You can use names or 'person a,' 'person b,' etc.

_____:_____

_____

7. In English, while we're talking we use lots of expressions like "hmm. . .," "well. . .," "anyway. . .," as "connectors" or to give us time to think of our next point. Have you noticed any such expressions used in Spanish?

YES NO EXAMPLES:

_____

8. In the episodes of *Destinos* that you've seen, Angela and Raquel began to call each other 'tú.' If in the future they meet at a formal, black-tie party, what should they call each other?
tú usted

EXPLAIN _____
_____

What have you noticed about the concept of politeness (manners) in "typical" Spanish-speaking countries as opposed to "typical" American English culture?

What similarities and differences have you noticed regarding how we console people in the above two languages/cultures?

What similarities or differences have you noticed regarding how we make requests in the above two languages/cultures?

Have you noticed people using the term 'please'/ 'por favor' more in English or in Spanish?

ENGLISH SPANISH DON'T KNOW

13. In *Destinos,* there were characters from many different countries. What differences did you notice in the way they spoke Spanish?

14. Have you noticed any terms that one group of Spanish-speakers uses to criticize another group of Spanish-speakers (i.e., 'ethnic slurs' between Spanish speakers)?
YES NO

EXAMPLES

15. Please take a minute or two and write quickly <u>in note form and in English</u> the details that you remember from the episodes of *Destinos* that you saw this semester.

APPENDIX F
ORAL FEEDBACK
INSTRUCTIONS FOR ORAL ROLE PLAYS:

Decide who will be 'Person A' and who will be 'Person B' before going any further.

Briefly cover each of the four situations listed below using the Spanish words that "typical" Spanish-speakers would most likely use in these situations. You may use what you remember from the characters in *Destinos* as a guide.
RELAX and speak into the mike. This will not be graded and it is totally anonymous!

[NOTE: Numbers were added later. They indicate the items that the were being analyzed for the study.]

Situation 1--Person A calls person B on the phone

1. B: Answer phone.
2. A: Greet and identify yourself.
   B: Greet.
3. A: Ask if you can use Person B's Spanish book.
   B: Say yes.
4. A and B: End call.

Situation 2 Person B waits tables in a fancy, five-star restaurant. Person A is the customer.

5. B: Greet and ask for A's order.
6. A: Order wine.
   B: Respond.

Situation 3 Person A goes to a party with Person B. Person A runs into an old friend named Maria. Person A introduces Maria to Person B.

7. A: Greet Maria. Then introduce her to Person B.
8. B: Respond appropriately.

Situation 4 (For this one, Person A is a 'don Juan' and Person B is a female he has must met!) Person A, B, and A's naïve girlfriend are at the beach. While Person A's girlfriend is not looking, he flirts with her friend, Person B.

9. A: Flirt with B by asking two personal questions. Wait for an answer between each one.
10. B: Deflect these advances firmly, but quietly, so that your friend, A's girlfriend, will not hear.

APPENDIX G
MULTIPLE-CHOICE FEEDBACK

EXPERIMENTAL SECTION-DESTINOS
The following section will not affect your grade on the exam or in the course, but it will help researchers to find effective ways of using the Destinos programs and of teaching certain important sociolinguistic concepts. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

PLEASE MARK THE MOST CULTURALLY APPROPRIATE RESPONSE TO THE FOLLOWING SITUATIONS. USE THE WAY THE CHARACTERS IN DESTINOS TREATED EACH OTHER TO HELP ANSWER.

1. You are in a Spanish-speaking country and someone knocks on your door. While you're on the way to answer, you should say:
   a. Con permiso
   b. Vengo
   c. Ya voy
   d. Estoy viniendo

2. An older person of the opposite sex stops you on the street to ask for directions to the nearby movie theater. You should reply:
   a. Doble usted a la derecha.
   b. Dobla tu a la derecha.
   c. No response, any communication would be improper.
   d. Voy contigo.

3. While you're in your hotel room in Mexico the phone rings. How should you answer it?
   a. Hola
   b. Buenos días
   c. ¿Quién habla?
   d. Bueno

4. You go to have dinner with a family who has a five-year-old child. How should you ask him his age?
   a. ¿Cuántos años tiene usted?
   b. ¿Cuántos años tienes tú?
   c. Inappropriate question in this culture
   d. Ask parents; not child

5. How should you order a glass of wine in a five star restaurant?
   a. Dame un vino tinto por favor
   b. Deme un vino tinto.
   c. Me gustaría un vino tinto
   d. ¿Puedo tener un vino tinto?

6. When is it appropriate to say 'buenas noches' in Spanish?
   a. Only when you are leaving
   b. Only when you first see people
   c. Both of the above
   d. Neither of the above

7. You walk into a friend's apartment for the first time and want to compliment her apartment.. You say:
   a. ¡Qué guapo!
   b. ¡Qué lindo!
   c. ¡Qué bueno!
   d. Mi apartamento es más grande

8. From Destinos, what have you noticed about the concept of politeness in different cultures?
   a. Direct translations of what is polite in English sound just as polite in Spanish.
   b. What is friendly in English may sound unfriendly in Spanish and vice versa.
   c. English speakers are more polite.
   d. Spanish speakers are more polite.
   e. Other_____

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").